




PLANNING DEPARTMENT

TOWN OF GRAFTON
GRAFTON MEMORIAL MUNICIPAL CENTER
30 PROVIDENCE ROAD
GRAFTON, MASSACHUSETTS 01519
(508) 839-5335 ext. 1120 • FAX (508) 839-4602
planningdept@grafton-ma.gov
www.grafton-ma.gov

MEMORANDUM

TO: Norman Hill, Land Planning Inc.
Marc Theroux

FROM: Joseph Laydon, Town Planner

DATE: June 10, 2016 

SUBJECT: Review of 103 Worcester Street Site Plan Revised on June 8, 2016

On June 7th I distributed comments to you regarding the most recent version of the site plan set for 103 Worcester Street. We met on the afternoon of the 7th to cover comments from myself and Maria Mast. Following the meeting, a revised plan set and cover letter was submitted on June 9th. The following is a review of the revised plans dated June 8, 2016 and received June 9, 2016.

Town Planner's June 7th Comments

1. You are proposing to push back the tree line on the site. The proposed grading plans do not show the existing treeline and does not label the proposed treeline as being proposed. This makes it difficult to assess the changes occurring to the treeline and to the grading. **COMMENT: This has been addressed in revised plan set.**
2. Your existing conditions plan does not establish the existing treeline adjacent to the depression near Harris Street. There is vegetation in this area that needs to be protected to maintain screening between the project and residents on Bernard Road. This was discussed in the last hearing with the Board. Since the limit of work encompasses this area, I expect all vegetation will be cleared. I will be recommending to the Board as a condition that a site walk occur to determine the amount of clearing that will be necessary in the Harris Street r-o-w with the intent to allow only that necessary to construct the elements on the plan. **COMMENT: This has been addressed in revised plan set.**
3. Your grading of the retention basin will disturb the foundation remains for the old barn, however the plans do not call for this feature to be removed. **COMMENT: This has been addressed in revised plan set.**
4. The grading plan indicated the existing grade of 330 being tied into the the building. Looking at the grading coming around the north corner adjacent to the treeline, you are proposing a change to the grade at elevation 332. As you come around the Worcester Street side, the next proposed grade is 328. There does not appear to be a spot where you tie the foundation back in to 330. **COMMENT: This has mostly been addressed in revised plan set. The contours on the Worcester Street side of the building do not appear to be correct as it appears there is a conflict between the proposed tree line and the**

grades adjacent to the building. This is a minor issue however as the limit of work will be established and grading into the area will not be permitted.

5. The privacy fence should be extended the full length of the parking lot. Also why is an aluminum fence being proposed for an area that will not be visible. **COMMENT: This has been addressed in revised plan set. Fencing around basin has been removed and vegetation rather than fencing is proposed in the area between the basin and the existing tree line.**

6. Your waiver request does not provide justification for the waiver from providing a photometric plan. Furthermore there has been no information submitted on the proposed lighting on the building to determine whether lighting is adequate. There are corners of the property that are far from entrances that appear to not be illuminated. This remains open from my March 3rd letter. **COMMENT: While the waiver remains, I still do not believe that enough information has been submitted to justify the waiver. Since the last set, parking lights have been added back to the plans. The plans do not have any details on the mounting heights. Information could have been submitted detailing the spread of the lights. I also question whether these are the most appropriate fixtures. Also, the manufacture has LED versions which should be considered.**

Only three lights are proposed in the parking lot and their placement does not appear to be optimal. Specifically, the one near the dumpster should be shifted down two parking spaces to cover more spaces while maintaining coverage of the dumpster area. The light proposed near the Harris Street entrance is located at the corner of the parking spaces, while it does provide coverage for the entrance; it may not provide adequate coverage to parking spaces more internal to the lot. I think it is being located to serve two purposes, but in the end I don't think it covers the parking lot enough. Give consideration to another light to illuminate the parking lot.

For the light near Worcester Street, it does not appear to be optimally placed. The light is opposite the parking spaces and is located nearly 10 feet higher than Worcester Street. I am concerned the lighting element will be visible to the travelling public. I also don't think it will be located to provide illumination at the first entrance. If we had a plan that indicated lighting on the building, it may be possible to remove the light and place a pole fixture near the sidewalk on the Worcester Street elevation, or a similar fixture at a reduced height adjacent to the sidewalk.

7. The construction access is not adequate. 10 feet for a construction entrance should be widened and installed to accommodate turning vehicles. There is a discrepancy on the detail length for the construction access (50') vs the scaled plan version (30'). This remains open from my March 3rd memo. **COMMENT: This has been addressed in revised plan set.**

8. I am concerned that all the surface runoff from the parking lot is going towards two catch basins. The northern entrance has a catch basin on the northern side of the curb and I am concerned that stormwater will bypass the grate and head down Harris. I am also concerned that the single grate in the parking lot will not be enough to handle all the runoff and wonder if a double catch basin is better suited for this area. I have concerns that we are relying on these two structures and the need for exacting execution to get the right grading in the pavement to make this work. **COMMENT: This has been addressed in revised plan set. I have spoken with Jeff Walsh and he is confident the stormwater system will work.**

9. Additional landscaping is needed on the facade facing Worcester Street. This is outstanding from an April 8th email. Landscaping should be added to the area around the sign. **COMMENT: This has partially been addressed in revised plan set. One flowering dogwood has been added to the**

Worcester Street side of the property. No landscaping has been called for in the planting areas adjacent to the building, with the exception of one decorative tree.

10. I am concerned about the parking lot pavement nearest to Worcester Street dropping off with no curbing or vegetation/landscaping to demark the drop off. I am also concerned that snow will be plowed off this end and melt water directed to Worcester Street. **COMMENT: This appears been addressed in revised plan set by the plans calling for a monolithic berm.**

11. The only snow storage area is located on either side of the dumpster. I do not believe the storage areas is adequate for the area of parking lot that will be plowed. **COMMENT: This has been addressed in revised plan set as there is now an additional snow storage area on the left side of the parking lot. However there appears to be a conflict with the landscape plan as there are trees that are now next to the parking lot. Recommend shifting these trees back to allow for the snow storage area. The snow storage area that is located over the subsurface recharge area now shows there to be a monolithic berm, which would interfere with snow removal.**

12. The sign is located on a slope. The sign detail that was submitted, does not reflect it being installed on a slope. One post will be nearly 4 feet longer than the other. This needs to be provided to determine compliance with zoning provisions. This remains open from my April 8th email. **COMMENT: This has been addressed through the submission of a separate sign plan, however there should be a note explaining this on the landscape plan**

In addition to the responses to previous comments, I have the following comments on the revised plans.

1. Landscape plan: The number of trees does not match the number count. Also the plan states the proposed trees are “decorative.” The previous plan version called for a mixture of decorative and large growth shade trees. I recommend have some shade trees, decorative, and evergreens such as pine for the area to the left of the parking lot/ snow storage area.

2. Directional Signage: The plans show an entrance only sign but it is located at the northern entrance driveway. There should be a “No Exit” sign facing vehicles in the parking lot to prevent exiting through the entrance only. There should also be another directional sign (Do Not Enter – One Way Traffic) in the center landscape island to prevent vehicles entering against one-way traffic.

Please let me know if you have any questions regarding these comments.

Thank you.